UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,803	03/06/2002	William C. Houghton	06975-164001	6900

26171 7590 12/13/2007
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER	
SCHNURR, JOHN R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2623	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/090,803	HOUGHTON, WILLIAM C.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Schnurr	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 September 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34,36,38 and 40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34,36,38 and 40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06 March 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/06/2002, 01/16/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/27/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34, 36, 38 and 40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 11-15, 17-18, 21-23, 25-26, 30, 36, 38, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021).

As regards Claims 1, 36, and 38, Kurland discloses a method, apparatus, and computer readable medium for polling interactive television viewers, the method

comprising: identifying a pool of two or more entry elements; selecting entry elements such that subsets of entry elements are defined (such as responses to particular questions); configuring at least one polling request, each polling request including one of the subsets of entry elements, and each polling request prompting a viewer to evaluate at least some of the entry elements (these steps are necessary in the preparation of a market questionnaire to be distributed to panelists, cols. 3 and 4, lines 47-68 and 1-6); preparing a first evaluation round that includes at least the polling request (cols. 7 and 8, lines 61-68 and 1-11) connecting to one or more interactive television viewers (col. 10, lines 14-17); sending the first evaluation round to the one or more set top systems of the one or more interactive viewers (the device comprising figs. 31.34, 31.108, and 31.106 functions as a set top box with up stream connectivity through modem, 31.26, fig. 31.14a, cols. 9 and 10, lines 58-68 and 1-24); receiving responses to the first evaluation round (col. 7, lines 49-51); tallying the number of times that each of the entry elements has been selected by users participating in the first evaluation round (In order to identify the most popular elements for the second pool of revised elements the responses must be tallied, col. 7, lines 49-52); identifying, in response to tallying, a second pool of revised elements that reflect more popular elements as identified in the first evaluation round such that the second pool includes fewer elements than the first pool (identifying popular elements in survey results is basic analysis and further requires that the "most popular" results are fewer the possible results is said results are meaningful, col. 7, lines 49-52); selecting revised elements such as that subsets of revised elements are defined; configuring at least one second

polling request, each second polling request prompting a viewer to evaluated the revised elements, and preparing a subsequent evaluation round that includes at least the second polling request (fig. 3 shows that a questionnaire generally has more than one question, col. 7, lines 49-57).

Kurland does not disclose that the polling request in the first round enables a first user to select one of the entry elements multiple times and the response to the first polling request includes an indication of the number of times the entry elements were selected by the first user.

Walker discloses that the polling request in the first round enables a first user to select one of the entry elements multiple times and the response to the first polling request includes an indication of the number of times the entry elements were selected by the first user. (Fig. 9 table 900 shows the user is able to select an entry element multiple times, for example respondent question IDs 1 and 4, an indication of these selections are included in the responses, col. 8 line 52 to col. 9 line 4.)

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the multiple selections of the same entry elements of Walker, an analogous art, to the polling system of Kurland to allow the system to identify valid responses (col. 8 line 52 to col. 9 line 4 Walker).

Kurland and Walker do not disclose that each second polling request including one of the subsets of revised elements.

Shah-Nazaroff discloses that each second polling request including one of the subsets of revised elements (Shah-Nazaroff discloses, on figs. 4, 6, and 7,

questionnaires with a variety of questions and with several possible selections. Some questions have 3 possible responses. Some have two. Some have seven. Others can require other types. Shah-Nazaroff discloses the possibility to limit the possible responses of questions to a subset of responses of an arbitrary nature if desired).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the polling requests of Shah-Nazaroff, an analogous art, to the combined systems of Kurland and Walker to allow more effective and focused responses from the panelist.

Kurland, Walker and Shah-Nazaroff do not disclose that configuring at least one second polling request, each second polling request including one or more subsets of revised elements that reflect more popular elements in a first evaluation round, and each second polling request prompting a viewer to evaluate the revised elements selected from a second pool. Chung discloses that configuring at least one second polling request, each second polling request including one or more subsets of revised elements that reflect more popular elements in a first evaluation round, and each second polling request prompting a viewer to evaluate the revised elements selected from a second pool (paragraphs 169 and 171).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the runoff system of Chung, an analogous art, to the system of Kurland, Walker and Shah-Nazaroff so that a clearly popular choice can be made by the poll takers.

As regards Claim 11, Kurland further discloses designating polling rules for targeting the interactive television viewers (such as demographic data, col. 7, lines 57-60).

As regards Claim 2, Kurland discloses the method of claim 1 but fails to disclose that the first and second polling requests have two different sets of elements. Shah-Nazaroff discloses that the first and second polling requests have two different sets of elements (fig. 4, questions and answers to "Do you approve of the President's Performance in the Office" and "Your approval of the President's performance in Office has" are different).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the survey format of Shah-Nazaroff, an analogous art, with the questionnaire method of Kurland to give the user a variety of questions to respond to with a variety of answers.

As regards Claim 12, Kurland discloses the method of Claim 11 but fails to disclose determining context information of interactive television viewers. Shah-Nazaroff discloses determining context information of interactive television viewers (such as what program they are watching or just watched, paragraph 25).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the context information of Shah-Nazaroff, an analogous art, to the survey method of Kurland to ask more specific questions, perhaps questions relating to the program just watched.

As regards Claim 13, Kurland discloses applying the targeting rules to the context information to identify targeted interactive television viewers (such as by demographic data, col. 7, lines 57-60).

As regards Claim 14, Shah-Nazaroff discloses that determining the context information includes determining television programming being viewed by an interactive television viewer at a particular time (such as what program they are watching or just watched, paragraph 25).

As regards Claim 15, Shah-Nazaroff discloses determining television programming being viewed comprises determining the television programming tuned by a set top box (paragraphs 42, 43, and paragraph 53, lines 11-18).

As regards Claim 17, Shah-Nazaroff discloses determining context information associated with television programming available for delivery to the interactive television viewer (such as the program just watched, fig. 4, paragraph 42).

As regards Claim 18, Shah-Nazaroff discloses that determining context information based upon a television signal received by a set top box (such as the program just watched, fig. 4, paragraphs 42 and 43).

As regards Claim 21, Shah-Nazaroff discloses that preparing the first evaluation round includes preparing the polling requests based on context information associated with the television programming (such as preparing the survey to pertain to a program just watched, paragraph 44, and figs. 4 and 6).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the tailoring of polling requests as done in Shah-Nazaroff with the survey

method of Kurland so that the survey is most effective a gathering the opinions of the viewers.

As regards Claim 22, Shah-Nazaroff further discloses comprises determining context information based upon a television series (Shah-Nazoff deals with providing surveys about programming such as in fig. 4, paragraph 44, an this programming can take on a variety of forms such as television series which oftentimes are sitcoms, paragraph 22).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the tailoring of polling requests as done in Shah-Nazaroff with the survey method of Kurland so that the survey is most effective a gathering the opinions of the viewers.

As regards Claim 23, Shah-Nazaroff further discloses comprises determining context information based upon a television series (Shah-Nazoff deals with providing surveys about programming such as in fig. 4, paragraph 44, an this programming can take on a variety of forms such an episode of a television show which oftentimes are sitcoms or a news segment, paragraph 22).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the tailoring of polling requests as done in Shah-Nazaroff with the survey method of Kurland so that the survey is most effective a gathering the opinions of the viewers.

As regards Claim 25, Shah-Nazaroff discloses determining context information based on a program content catergory (such as asking specific questions about news broadcast, fig. 4, or children's film, fig. 6).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the tailoring of polling requests as done in Shah-Nazaroff with the survey method of Kurland so that the survey is most effective a gathering the opinions of the viewers.

As regards Claim 26, Shah-Nazaroff discloses prompting the interactive television viewer to select one element in the polling request of two or more elements (such as asking if approval increased or decreased or stayed the same, fig. 4).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the tailoring of polling requests as done in Shah-Nazaroff with the survey method of Kurland so that the survey will be intuitive and easy to fill out by the user.

As regards Claim 30, Shah-Nazaroff discloses that evaluating the responses includes determining which element in the polling request received the most votes (fig. 5).

As regards Claim 40, Shah-Nazaroff further discloses that at least one of he subsets of entry elements shares a common entry element with another of he subsets of entry elements (fig. 6).

4. Claims 3-5, 7, 8, 10, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in

view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in further view of Lett (US 5,539,822).

As regards Claim 3, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of claim 1 but fails to disclose that each element appearing in the set of polling requests is different from the every element appearing in the set of polling requests. Lett discloses that each element appearing in the set of polling requests is different from the every element appearing in the set of polling requests (fig. 3H).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the survey format of Lett, an analogous art, with the questionnaire method of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to give the user a variety of answers to use when responding to questions.

As regards Claim 4, Lett discloses that identifying a second poll of revised elements includes tallying the responses to the first evaluation round that have been received after a time limit (col. 16, lines 43-67).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the "timeout" of Lett, an analogous art, with the questionnaire method of Kurland to insure the prompt collection of data.

As regards Claim 5, Lett further discloses that the time limit is applied relative to a period that begins when the first evaluation round is initially displayed to an interactive television viewer (col. 16, lines 43-48).

As regards Claim 7, Lett discloses displaying particular content to the interactive television viewers based on evaluating the responses to the first evaluation round (such

as showing the results gleaned from a plurality of participants to the questionnaire, fig. 4B.350 and col. 16, lines 64-67).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the summarization data to viewers, as done in Lett, an analogous art, to the survey method of Kurland and Shah-Nazaroff because viewers are often curious about other people's opinions.

As regards Claim 8, Kurland and Lett disclose the method of Claim 7 but fails to disclose that the particular content includes a graphical user interface. Shah-Nazaroff discloses that the particular content includes a graphical user interface (such as an EPG, fig. 3, paragraphs 33-37).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to put the modified EPG of Shah-Nazaroff alongside the survey results of Kurland and Lett to allow the user easy access to highly rated programs on the survey.

As regards Claim 10, Lett discloses that the displaying of particular content uses the set top system (fig. 1.14, col. 5, lines 6-19 and 34-41).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use the set top system to display results, as done in Lett, an analogous art, to the survey method of Kurland and Shah-Nazaroff so that the results are easily accessible to the viewer.

As regards Claim 34, Lett discloses that the set of polling requests includes sending a display to overlay television programming (col. 16, lines 33-36).

At the time of invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use an overlay to display the survey, as done in Lett, an analogous art, to the survey method of Kurland and Shah-Nazaroff so that the survey is easily accessible to the viewer.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in view of Lett (US 5,539,822) and in further view of Hattori (US 5,719,619).

As regards Claim 6, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, Chung, and Lett disclose the method of claim 4 but fail to disclose that the time limit is common to all of the interactive television viewers. Hattori discloses that the time limit is common to all of the interactive television viewers (such as five minutes, col. 27, 48-60).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the time period of Hattori, an analogous art, with the questionnaire method of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, Lett, and Chung to insure the prompt collection of valid data.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in further view of Lett (US 5,539,822) and in further view of Bejan (US 5,465,384).

As regards Claim 9, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, Chung, and Lett disclose the method of Claim 7 but fails to disclose that the particular content includes multimedia data. Bejan discloses that the particular content includes multimedia data (such video scenes, abstract, figs. 2.114 and 2.116, col. 8, lines 7-39).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to show the user selected scenes of Bejan after the survey of Kurland and Lett to allow the user some control over programming content.

7. Claims 16, 19, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in further view of Belmont (US 5,819,156).

As regards Claim 16, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 14 but fail to disclose that determining television programming being viewed comprises determining the television programming using an EPG. Belmont discloses that determining television programming being viewed comprises determining the television programming using an EPG (col. 3, lines 53-65).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the television programming identification system of Belmont, an analogous art, with the survey system of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to make sure that the questionnaire is appropriate for the program just watched.

As regards Claim 19, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 17 but fail to disclose determining context information based upon a channel identification number. Belmont discloses determining context information based upon a channel identification number (by tracking channels watched and cross-referencing them with a program guide, col. 3, lines 53-65).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the channel identification system of Belmont, an analogous art, with the survey system of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to make sure that the questionnaire is appropriate for the program just watched.

As regards Claim 24, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 17 but fail to disclose determining context information based upon an EPG identity. Belmont discloses determining context information based upon an EPG indentity (by tracking channels watched and cross-referencing them with a program guide, questions could then be tailored, col. 3, lines 53-65).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the program identification based on EPG data of Belmont, an analogous art, with the survey system of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to make sure that the questionnaire is appropriate for the program just watched by the viewer.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US

2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in further view of Aras (US 5,872,588).

As regards Claim 20, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 17 but fail to disclose determining context information based upon a broadcast identificafier. Aras discloses determining context information based upon a channel identification number (by embedding the broadcaster ID inside the tag, it becomes easy to identify the broadcaster, col. 8, lines 52-65).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the broadcaster identification system of Aras, an analogous art, with the survey system of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to make sure that the questionnaire is appropriate for the program just watched.

9. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in further view of Frost (US 5,041,972).

As regards Claim 27, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 1 but fail to disclose prompting an interactive television viewer to rank order a list of elements. Frost discloses prompting an interactive television viewer to rank order a list of elements (fig. 1 and col. 7, lines 32-54).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the ranking interface of Frost, an analogous art, with the survey system of

Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to give the user an easy way to evaluate programs.

10. Claims 28-29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in view of Chung (US 2004/0046021).

As regards Claim 28, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 1 but fails to disclose determining two or more elements in the new polling request includes a most selected element in a first polling request and a most selected element in a second polling request. Shah-Nazaroff discloses determining the most selected element in a first polling request and a most selected element in the second polling request (fig. 5). Kurland and Nazaroff, however, fail to disclose that most selected elements comprise two or more elements in a new polling request. Chung discloses that most selected elements comprise two or more elements in a new polling request (paragraphs 169 and 171).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the element selection system of the Chung, an analogous art, with the poll creation method of Kurland and Shah-Nazaroff to allow users to pick programs using a common, easy-to-understand tournament system.

As regards Claim 29, the Chung further discloses that the set of polling requests continues until there is one element that has not been selected to a lesser degree than other elements in any polling request of the most selected elements and the other

elements (after the various rounds, the winner has a majority of the votes, paragraphs 169 and 171).

As regards Claim 31, the rejection is similar to the rejection of Claim 28. Shah-Nazaroff discloses that determining two or more elements in the new polling request includes a least selected element in a first polling request and a least selected element in a second polling request (Shah-Nazaroff shows which element receives the least votes as well, fig. 5, and this could be used as the criterion for advancing in the tournament. This could be used in combination with the "run-off" method of Chung).

11. Claims 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurland (US 4,603,232) in view of Walker (US 6,093,026) further in view of Shah-Nazaroff (US 2002/0053077) and in further view of Chung (US 2004/0046021) and in further view of McKissick (US 2006/0190966).

As regards Claim 32, Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung disclose the method of Claim 1 but fail to disclose sending a set of polling requests includes sending an instant message. McKissick discloses sending a set of polling requests includes sending an instant message (McKissick makes it clear any message with any content can be sent to a set top box in a timely fashion using an instant message, paragraph 88).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the instant messaging of McKissick, an analogous art, with the survey system

of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to provide a widely known and reliable way to send the survey to the user.

As regards Claim 33, McKissick discloses sending the set of polling requests includes sending an electronic mail message (McKissick makes it clear any message with any content can be sent to a set top box in a timely fashion using an e-mail, paragraph 121).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the e-mail feature of McKissick, an analogous art, with the survey system of Kurland, Walker, Shah-Nazaroff, and Chung to provide a widely known and reliable way to send the survey to the user.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John R. Schnurr whose telephone number is (571) 270-1458. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRS

CHRISTOPHER GRANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600